

THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. VI.

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.

NO. 12.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

[SATURDAY, MARCH 19, 1836.]

THE LIBERATOR

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT
NO. 15, WASHINGTON STREET, BY
ISAAC KNAPP.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

TERMS.

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, ADVANCE.
All letters and communications must be post paid. The rule is imperative, in order to shield us from the frequent imposition of our readers. Those, therefore, who wish their letters to be taken from the Post Office by us, will be careful to pay their postage.

REFUGE OF OPPRESSION.

REPORT

Of the Joint Special Committee of the Massachusetts Legislature, on the memorial of the Anti-Slavery Society.

The Joint Special Committee to whom was referred the memorial of certain persons called the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, in which they state that the Committee refused them a full hearing in the premises, ask leave respectfully to submit the following

REPORT.

In the progress of their investigations the matters originally referred to them; and while they were preparing to report to the Legislature, your Committee received, through their Chairman, a note from an individual, requesting to be heard before them, on the part of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and stating as a reason therefor, that their motives had been misrepresented, and their conduct misjudged. From the very first moment, your Committee entertained the strongest doubt, to express it in no more decisive language, as to the extent of their power to permit a hearing in this behalf. But being well aware that their report, and the subsequent actions of the Legislature thereon, might, in some way or other, affect the interests of the persons requesting to be heard, and remembering that these individuals were our fellow citizens, under whatever name, asking a remedy at the source of justice, and entertaining a strong desire to avoid every appearance of expressing an opinion, without a full understanding of the real desires of the persons in question from their own mouths, your Committee ventured to permit the meeting requested, hoping that the power which gave them their authority, would, in the end, appreciate their motives, and justify their conduct.

Your Committee could not but be aware, that strictly speaking, the only parties to the papers in their possession, were the Legislature, and the Legislatures of the five states, who transmitted the documents upon which they were deliberating, to our own Executive; and that the investigations could hardly help assuming something of an *ex parte* character, when the Anti-Slavery Societies were permitted to appear, with such allegations and evidence as they choose to submit, while the southern planter could not, in the nature of the case, be present, either to reply by argument, or to offer testimony in behalf of his own side of the case. Your Committee, however, ventured to overlook all this, and heard the party upon two several occasions. At both hearings, and particularly the second, your Committee regretted to find, in a portion of the speakers, instead of a modest demeanor becoming citizens in presence of a Committee of the Legislature, instead of that modest demeanor becoming citizens in presence of a Committee of the Legislature, a vehemence both of language and manner, and an open avowal of their determination to pursue their object at all hazards, which did not tend to conciliate the sentiments of your Committee, and whose purpose seemed to be to arouse feelings already unstable enough upon this highly exciting topic.

The Committee suggested to the individuals appearing, that they were permitted to come in merely as a matter of favor and indulgence, and not upon any ground of right; but notwithstanding all this, the committee, by its chairman, has been several times called upon to interpose, in order to check irrelevant discussion, and to restrain offensive and improper language. But whatever might have been the intentions of these individuals, your committee certainly listened to many things, upon these occasions, of a nature so indecorous and improper, that they had frequent occasion to regret that the indulgence of a hearing had been granted at all.

The Committee feel that to be the most painful part of their duty, where none has been very agreeable; and they trust that the Legislature will understand, that the report they make on this point is intended only as a reason why no further hearing should be granted to the individuals in question. In point of fact, at the first meeting, four persons appearing in behalf of the Anti-Slavery Society, occupied about two hours and a half in speaking; at the second meeting, four persons, in part the same, occupied about an equal amount of time; and your committee found nothing in the whole argument, to change their previous impressions. Neither have they any reason to believe that any new view of the subject is likely to be presented. Indeed, your committee would on no account recommend any further hearing upon this question. The large assembly which attended the second meeting above mentioned, was evidently in a state of much excitement; and the consequences of another could only be an increased agitation of the public mind. Your committee have reason to believe, that at least some of those who appeared before them, desire this above all things; and the only explanation of the complaint in their memorial against the committee is, that either wilfully, or from mistaken views, they misunderstood the true nature of 'free discussion,' which your committee with them, consider of inestimable value; the committee deeming it to be subject to the well known rules of courtesy, respect for the characters and rights of others, and the observance due to the constituted authorities of the State; they apparently holding it to be liable to no limitation or restraint whatever. But your committee have

yet to learn, and they trust that the time for such a lesson has not arrived, that it is any part of their business in the discharge of duties at least arduous and unpleasant, to find themselves subjected to violent and improper language, without an attempt to preserve that decorum which is due to their own self-respect, and the honor of the Commonwealth.

They report, therefore, that the memorialist have leave to withdraw. By order of the Committee.
GEORGE LUNT, Chairman.

COMMUNICATIONS.

THE GREAT QUESTION.

[Continued.]

Let us go back a short distance into events which make a part of our history. Let us see if our notions of liberty—of consequences weighed and sacrifices made—were the same that we now maintain.

We were the lawful subjects of Great Britain. She imposed burdens upon us which many were unwilling to bear. She was unjust and inhuman—but she was not so unnatural as to buy and sell us, or subject men, women, and children, to the refined tortures of tiger-hearted cruelty. Her government did not fill the measure of its guilt by severing our families, by purchasing its members to be disposed of how, when, and where, she chose. No enormity like this was contemplated, and our bondage as *British subjects* was infinitely lighter than that of *American slaves*. But there were not wanting in those days 'incendiaries,' 'domestic' and 'foreign,' who scattered their 'firebrands, arrows and death'—who excited us to rebellion, and to lift our pariahs arms against the nation from which we sprung. There was the 'Common Sense' of Paine, teaching the principles of liberty and right, inflaming the minds, and calling forth the energies of an injured people. There was a Washington, a Jefferson, an Adams, a Franklin, and a host of others whose master minds gave strength to the nerve of liberty and roused three millions of subjects to a desperate struggle and independence. And there also came to our aid that 'audacious foreigner,' Lafayette, who first set his foot on that 'chivalrous shore' which now seeks to make despotism doubly strong, by alien and sedition laws, and which is hoarsely loudly against that distinguished foreigner who has recently proclaimed the watchword of liberty from the house-tops, and revived the slumbering justice of freemen.

There were, also, in those days, other distinguished 'incendiaries' from foreign shores—'incendiaries' whose names are deeply enshrined in American bosoms, and whose names on the historic page are prominent and lovely to the view. Can we prove ungrateful and no longer remember Pulaski, Kosciuszko, in a word, the whole foreign host that came to our rescue? Then and here was a contest of blood, and profusely did it flow. No sacrifice was then deemed too great for the rights and liberties of man. But not so far extends the course now pursued by the pioneers of liberty—the inflexible defenders of man's inalienable rights, and the preservers of the balance of impartial justice. They do not say to the oppressed,

'Hereditary bondage, know ye not
Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow—
By their right arms the conquest must be wrought.'

No appeals to physical force are now made in this struggle for rights infinitely outraged. No training in the art of war for the destruction of human life—but by moral force our conquest must be won. We ask only for the exercise of our right—nor will yield it but in death—to proclaim our sentiments by speech and by the press. These are the only weapons of which we shall avail ourselves to effect a bloodless, and the most splendid revolution that ever earth or heaven witnessed.

We will not yet dismiss the comparison of past and present times. Perhaps it is because another ox is yoked, that the case is so altered; for so far as the parallel is concerned, his must be a narrow intellect who does not at once perceive that our colonial vassalage was infinitely preferable to the bondage to which we subject our dark skinned countrymen. Yet, the 'interference' of France was an 'interference' of physical force. She aided, by such force, the rebellious vassals of England, in breaking the yoke, and prostrating the 'institutions' by which we were bound the lawful subjects to authority we had ever acknowledged. Well, for this 'interference' of France, in the 'domestic' matter of England's colonial government, what American will not rejoice to the latest hour of his life? Have abolitionists contended for an 'interference' of this kind? Have they said to the slave—rely upon your sword for freedom? if they have, when and where? Let the evidence be produced.

At the time of the Grecian struggle against Turkish despotism, the sympathies of this nation were wafted to that suffering people. We encouraged them—we rejoiced in their resistance, and their victories however bloody, gladdened the hearts of Americans. But according to the logic of the present day, we were, in our sympathies, the 'very worst enemies' of the Greeks. And France, when she was our ally, as well as our revolutionary leaders, was 'our very worst enemies,' as we, doubtless, suffered much more during our revolutionary struggle, than at any time preceding it. As if this charge is not equally applicable to all such struggles; and as if Liberty was not worth the sacrifices made to obtain it. How admirably our consistency is preserved!

But we are met in the tone of triumphant assertion that our reasons are of no force, because, as asserted, the American despotism of slavery, has no points analogous to the despotism, which America and the 'official interference' of her allies prostrated—which Greece and her 'meddlesome' friends disabled, but which has overwhelmed Poland, and annihilated her existence. As if curative, the all-pervading principle

of despotism, preserves not its universal identity, however diversified its features may appear. Why, the causes of the revolutionary struggles of France, of Greece, of Poland, of our own country, are not minutely and circumstantially parallel—parallel to the very letter. There was greater or less tyranny—tyranny under different aspects—in all these cases; but, however various the forms, the spirit of despotism is always the same; and the more unjust and revolting the despotism, the more praiseworthy and justifiable the attempt to overthrow it. The question is not what the *kind* of tyranny is, but whether it exists, and its injustice, intolerable. Arguments will remain parallel against despotism, though it approaches under a thousand different aspects.

Admitting then that no form of despotism in all its circumstances and external features, was ever parallel to another. What then, is action precluded because the spirit appears in a different shape? There is such a truth as *equal rights*, and here a parallel can be sustained to the very letter; for if a man has a right to contend for his liberty, unjustly invaded by despotic power under one shade, surely another man has the same right to make a like defence against invasion, equally unjust, though by unjust power which presents itself in another form. If the tyranny be equally great, the means deemed justifiable and resorted to in one instance to overthrow it, one equally justifiable if resorted to in the other. And is the despotism of slavery which is so fondly nourished in our country's bosom, less cruel, less unjust, than those despotisms which have been overthrown at a tremendous cost? No! The comparative strength of all the facts in the case, is greatly in favor of the Abolitionists. None of the despotisms we have presented for illustration equalled in cruel injustice and savage barbarity, the American system of slavery. Then let it be the duty of every son of Liberty to utter his voice against this overgrowing Colossus whose ponderous weight has ground millions of human beings to nothingness.

The first tenet in our national catechism is that 'ALL men are created free and equal.' The second is that 'Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God!'—but now that our ox is yoked, these self-evident truths have, on a sudden, become downright 'treason' and 'incendiaries.' We were not wont to be so scrupulous touching the 'interference' of France in our behalf; and yet, how much more tenable the ground on which England could have based herself, than any we can obtain for our defence of the 'domestic institution of slavery.' France, a FOREIGN nation, by physical force 'interfered.' Let us suppose a letter of remonstrance from George 3d to Louis 16th.

'To Louis 16th, King of France:

Sir—It is with mingled feelings of regret and indignation that I discover hostile and incendiary movements on the part of your subjects, and under the protection of the royal sanction. Movements which indicate the most unjustifiable interference in my domestic affairs. I need hardly say that I attribute to the interference in my American Colonies. Sir, the supposed wrongs which a morbid sensibility has transformed into intolerable tyranny as supposed to be exercised over my American subjects, is a domestic matter exclusively my own—and with which you can have no concern. I call upon you to desist, at once, from that officious intermeddling by which you are turning my own household against me. This struggle can only result in greater hardships to my vassals. You are compelling me to add weight to chains which were scarcely felt before this insurrectionary spirit of liberty was excited among them by 'domestic' and 'foreign' 'incendiaries.' Think not I will yield to the clamors of my dissatisfied subjects. 'They are a rebellious and still-necked people.' But how can they prevail against my resources and my power. Think of the blood that must flow if this blind infatuation for Liberty continues. You, sir, are sustaining these misguided fanatics; and in as far as you do so, you are responsible for the consequences. These vile incendiaries, Washington, Paine, Jefferson, Adams, and many others who are scattering firebrands, arrows and death among a hitherto quiet and contented people, cannot remain guiltless of the blood from this wide spread insurrection against lawful and beneficent authority. Sir, there are distinguished citizens leaving your shores to make their abode among my dissatisfied children—to take sides with them and thereby to further augment the domestic trouble. Recall I beseech you that audacious intermeddler and vile miscreant, Lafayette, who is foremost in this crusade to establish by force of arms rights and liberties which never existed save in the distempered fancy of hair-brained fanatics.'

'GEORGE.'

In the recent Polish struggle, England and France were reproached by their own distinguished citizens for the non-interference to save the Polish people from the fatal grasp of the Russian Bear. We, too, were loud in our execrations against the Russian Autocrat, from whom let us suppose the following epistolary remonstrance.

The Emperor Nicholas to the American People:

It is with no pleasant feelings that I observe a disposition among you to disturb the amicable relations hitherto existing between us. Your meddlesome sympathies in behalf of the unfortunate Poles, excite them to revolt and insurrection, and endanger the peace of my dominions. Your fanatical publications assail us on all sides, and scatter firebrands, arrows and death, among a people who are my property by the right of conquest. To the superior strength of my sword they have submitted. But your fiend-like spirit of incendiary is inflaming, among these subjects, the almost quenched embers of freedom. You would alienate them from lawful authority. You would have them assert a misnamed,

right, and to rise sword in hand for the prostration of the 'powers that be'—though the unequal struggle could only drench the land with their blood. Your incendiary missiles, flung among us, can only have the effect to make the condition of the Poles infinitely worse. Wherefore, then, will you continue this interference of discussing and denouncing my government? Will not the far more rigorous fate to which you compel me to subject the Polish insurgents, teach you to stifle and subdue those womanish emotions which multiply the victims you would rescue? For one discontented subject banished ere your seditious principles of freedom took root among them, ten more are driven to the living graves of Siberia. You are the very worst enemies to the Poles. You excite hopes which can never be realized, and violent government becomes necessary to subdue the spirit that aspires to the consummation of a dream.

But while you are pouring out libations of tears over the imaginary wrongs of Poland, cast your eyes over the face of your own country—the land of the free—and see if a revolting stain be not deeply impainted there. Ye vile impostors and hypocrites! who boast yourselves the reformers of nations! What means that domestic institution of slavery too sacred for discussion? What means it, in a land where ALL are born free and equal, two and a half millions of native born Americans are ground to the earth by what you are pleased to call a 'beneficent despotism?' What means that weeping and lamentation and Rachel mourning for her children because they are not—those strokes of the lash—those cries of distress? and those acts of despair? which are borne to my ears in terrific blasts from truth's avenging trumpet. Even innocent blood with which your slave-trodden ground is glutted, appeals in vain to the impartial justice of your country! O America! paragon of nations! Ye are as whitened sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

You who enforce the republican maxim that resistance to tyrants is the first duty of man, what had been your destiny had your enslaved subjects practiced upon this precept in its literal acceptance? Long ere this your land had been smoking with the blood of numberless tyrants, and they had fertilized the soil which had been cultivated by the victims of their rapacity.'

[To be continued.]

EAST RANDOLPH ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING.

In accordance with public notice, a meeting of citizens favorable to the formation of an Anti-Slavery Society, in East Randolph, was held on Tuesday, March 1st, 1836, at the Athenaeum. Capt. Jonathan White was called to the chair, and William W. Sinfield appointed Secretary.

The meeting was opened with prayer by Rev. David Brigham, after which the chairman stated the object of the meeting. The following Resolution was then offered by Mr. F. D. Holbrook, which was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That it is expedient to organize a society in this place, for the abolition of slavery in the United States, and to promote the moral and intellectual condition of the colored people generally.

The following declaration and constitution was presented, and after being read and discussed was unanimously adopted:

DECLARATION.

That all men are born free and equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, we hold to be not a mere rhetorical flourish, but 'self-evident truths.' Consequently, we hold that slavery, as it exists in these United States, is at war with the fundamental principles on which the federal constitution is based; and that it is no where sanctioned, though it is tolerated by the constitution. We hold that the Congress of the U. S. has no right to abolish or regulate slavery in the several slaveholding states; but that it has constitutional power, which it ought immediately to exercise to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia and in the territories of the U. S., and also to regulate the slave trade among the several states, where it is carried on.

We hold further, that slavery is not only at variance with the fundamental principles of our federal constitution, but that it is morally evil and sinful, utterly condemned by the divine law of love and the whole tenor of the word of God; and hence, that it is the duty of slaveholders immediately, at once to repent of this sin, and do works meet for repentance by undoing the heavy burdens and letting the oppressed go free. We hold that the people of the non-slaveholding states, while they have no right either by legislation or physical force to interfere with slavery in the other states, have the right and are bound both by the constitution of their country and the law of God, to use all moral means in their power for the correction of public opinion on this subject, both at the north and the south; and for effecting in this peaceable way the universal emancipation of their brethren now held in unjust and cruel servitude. The moral means to be used, we hold, to be principally free discussion, and the circulation in the length and breadth of our land of publications filled with light and love. The right and privilege of using these means, we hold are guaranteed to us and to all our fellow citizens, by our federal constitution, which secures the freedom of speech and of the press. These rights and privileges we can never, on any condition, surrender; our duty to God, ourselves and our fellow men forbids it, and requires that we avail ourselves of them to do good unto all men, and especially to give liberty to the two and a half millions of the oppressed bondmen of our country. In accordance, therefore, with what we hold to be our right, our duty, and our privilege, and that we may act with efficiency in our efforts with others, for the abolition of slavery in the United States, we hereby associate ourselves and adopt, as the basis of our union, the following

CONSTITUTION.

Article 1. This society shall be called the East Randolph Anti-Slavery Society, and shall be auxiliary to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

Art 2. The object of this society shall be to discuss the subject of slavery, to obtain and diffuse information respecting it, and respecting our duties in relation to it; and to use all suitable means to effect its entire abolishment in the United States.

Art 3. Any person may become a member of this society by signing the constitution, and may withdraw from it at any time by notifying the secretary of his intention, and requesting the erasure of his name.

Art 4. The officers of this society shall be a President, two Vice Presidents, a Corresponding and Recording Secretary and Treasurer, who, with five directors, shall constitute an executive committee to manage the concerns of the society.

Art 5. The Anniversary of this society shall be held during the first or second week in January, the Executive Committee to fix on the day and hour of meeting.

Art 6. The expenses of this society shall be defrayed by the voluntary contributions of its members.

Art 7. This constitution may be altered or amended at any regular meeting of the society by vote of a majority present.

Voted, That a committee of five be appointed to nominate a list of officers and report at the next meeting.

Col. Oramel White, Jacob Whitcomb, Ludovicus Wild, Asa Porter and Moses French, were appointed a committee.

Voted, That this meeting adjourn to Tuesday Evening, March 8, at 6 1-2 o'clock, at this place.

TUESDAY, March 8.

Society met according to adjournment. The committee on nominations reported the following list of persons for the officers of the society the ensuing year, who were unanimously elected:

President—Dea. Elisha Holbrook.
1st Vice President—Joseph Faxon.
2d Vice President—Capt. Jonathan White.
Cor. Secretary—Rev. David Brigham.
Rec. Secretary—Wm. W. Sinfield.
Treasurer—Thaddeus French.

Directors—Richard Belcher, Jr., F. D. Holbrook, Moses French, Asa Porter, Allen Merritt.

The following resolutions were offered by Rev. David Brigham and unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the preservation of the Union, and the prosperity of our country, especially of the slaveholding states, demand the immediate abolition of slavery.

Resolved, That the opposition manifested both at the north and the south, to free discussion on the subject of slavery, is unworthy of freemen, an assault upon the very palladium of both civil and religious liberty, deserves and will have the unqualified reprobation of every well informed patriot and Christian.

Resolved, That the inconsistent and self-contradictory statements and reasonings of slaveholders and their abettors, on the subject of slavery, prove the badness of their cause.

Resolved, That the history of abolition, especially in the British West Indies, demonstrates both the safety and utility of immediate emancipation.

Resolved, That the cause of anti-slavery is peculiarly an appropriate sphere of action females, inasmuch as it is eminently the cause of humanity and religion, to adorn and promote which they are especially qualified by their Maker; and inasmuch as slavery involves multitudes of their own sex in its bitterest sufferings.

Voted, That the proceedings of the meeting be published in the Liberator and N. E. Spectator.

Voted, To adjourn sine die.
The society at the present time is composed of forty-two legal voters.

WILLIAM W. SINFIELD, Rec. Sec.

ANOTHER FEMALE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

PREAMBLE.—In consideration of the degraded condition of one million of our sisters, who are subjects of American slavery—who are treated by their fellow beings as marketable commodities—who are plundered daily of the fruits of their toil, without redress—who enjoy no constitutional nor legal protection from licentious and wicked outrages upon their persons—are ruthlessly torn asunder—the tender babe from the arms of its frantic mother—the heart-broken wife from her weeping husband, at the caprice or pleasure of irresponsible men; and, for the crime of having a dark complexion, suffer the pangs of hunger, the infliction of stripes, and the ignominy of perpetual servitude, and, added to this, whose minds, created for the most exalted purposes, are chained in heathen darkness, by laws expressly enacted to make their instruction a criminal offence.

And in view also of the truth of the scripture declaration, that 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth,'—we, who here affix our names, have been led to inquire, what shall we do to aid in the restoration of their rights, as inherited from the hand of their Creator, our Father in Heaven? what may we do for the relief of those who cannot do so much as even to speak for themselves in vindication of those rights granted by so great a Giver?

'Open thy mouth for the dumb, in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction. Open thy mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the needy.'

Endeavoring as far as possible to place our souls in their souls stand, the enquiry presses upon us, to whom should we look to plead our

cause, were our souls really 'in their souls' and the answer, with all the clearness of truth, presses with equal force, that, to professing Christian women of the North, we should specially look for an interest in our cause—to the benevolent-hearted women, whose minds have not been contaminated by the baleful influence of slavery.

We believe, then, that duty points to an untiring exertion to extend a moral influence, which shall have for its object the immediate and entire removal of this system of oppression from our land; and, although our influence may truly be compared to the 'widow's mite,' yet this mite we ought not to withhold.

Faith in the fulfilment of the blessed promises contained in the Holy Scriptures, is a necessary requisite for engaging, with any effect, in this momentous cause, and with such a confidence of success as we should undoubtedly have, were the objects of our benevolence as dear to us as are our own kindred.

When we consider our blessings, and contrast them with those enjoyed by our sisters of a sable hue, and reflect that we receive ours all from the hand of one common Father, from whose colored children we withhold life's dearest blessing, are we not ready to exclaim with the poet—

'Oh! why are dark chains bound
In such a world as this, where every sigh
Of wind and water hath of liberty
A strange undying sound?'—and that

'If there is one lesson to be learned
From God's creation; if there is a thought
Burning in the gentle tone
Of heaven's eternal language; if a voice
From the deep chambers of the unclouded sky,
That finds an echo in the unsearched depths
Of the heart's better feelings, it is this—
That God would have no slaves.'

With fervent desires that our exertions may not be unavailing, we agree to form ourselves into an Association, and to adopt the following constitution.

ART. 1. This Society shall be called The *Unbridge Female Anti-Slavery Society*, Auxiliary to the Worcester County Anti-Slavery Society, South Division.

ART. 2. Any female declaring the sentiments of the preamble to be her own, by signing this Constitution, and contributing to the funds, may be a member of this Society.

The remaining articles relate to the choice of officers, &c.

The Society was organized 3d month, 1st, 1826, by the choice of the following officers.

President—Lydia B. Capron,
Vice President—Sarah W. Grosvenor,
Treasurer—Chloe D. Capron,
Corresponding Secretary—Sylvia Willard,
Recording Secretary—Lucy W. Foster,
Counselors—Olive Chapin, Anne Basset, Maranda C. Foster, Martha Whipple, Catharine B. Capron, Lucretia C. Silby, Sarah Judson, Ann S. Haskell, Caroline Farnum, Sarah Ann Thayer, Ann Dudley, Mary Judson.

The Society consists of fifty-seven members, who have subscribed sixty-eight dollars.

INTERVIEWS WITH THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE.

Some account of the interviews which took place on the 4th and 8th of March, between a Committee of the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society and the Committee of the Legislature.

His Excellency, the Governor of this Commonwealth, saw fit to introduce into his inaugural speech, a severe censure of the Abolitionists, and to intimate his belief that they were guilty of an offence punishable at common law. This part of the speech was referred to a joint committee of five, of which Hon. George Lunt was chairman. To the same committee were also referred communications, which had been received by our Governor, from several of the Legislatures of the slaveholding states, requesting our General Court to enact laws, making it penal for the citizens of this state to form societies for the abolition of slavery, or to speak or publish sentiments, such as have been uttered in anti-slavery meetings, and published in anti-slavery tracts and papers.

By order of the Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, the Corresponding Secretary addressed a letter to the Committee of the Legislature, asking permission to appear before them and show reasons, why there should be no legislative action condemnatory of the Abolitionists. The request was granted, and on the 4th of March, the proposed interview took place, in the chamber of the Representatives.

Mr. Lucas, one of the Legislative Committee, objected to the proceeding—thought the gentlemen, who had had reason to pre-suppose the Legislature would do any thing prejudicial to them. They ought to have waited, he said, until the Committee had reported, before they proceeded on the supposition, that they were to be injured.

Mr. May replied that he thought he and his associates could not be mistaken in the present case. They belonged to that class of persons, spoken of in the Governor's Speech, in terms of severe censure—and to whom the communications referred, which had been received from several southern states, and upon which this Committee had been instructed by the Legislature to report. Mr. May read one or two of the resolutions of the southern Legislatures, respecting abolitionists and anti-slavery societies, and added, can the gentleman (Mr. Lucas) or this Committee, have any doubt that we, members of the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society, are a portion of that class of persons, upon whom the Legislature of this Commonwealth is called upon to pass censure? Surely not. Now it is on purpose to avert any action of this General Court, that might infringe the liberty of speech and of the press, that we have asked permission to show to this Committee why, we conceive there should be no legislative censures in any way passed upon abolitionists, and anti-slavery societies.

Mr. Lucas replied it was not to be supposed the Legislature of this Commonwealth would enact any law, abridging the liberty of speech and of the press. This could not be done constitutionally. It was very improper in the gentlemen of the anti-slavery society to proceed to this supposition.

Mr. May rejoined, that formerly it might indeed have seemed a gratuitous, nay, even an impertinent apprehension in any of the citizens of Massachusetts to fear that the Legislature of this state would enact any law, or take any action, insubstantial to the most sacred rights of the citizens. But recent events have admonished us that we may not safely rely any longer upon the assurance that our liberties are safe. Alarming encroachments have been made upon them already. And that reverence for liberty which is as Mr.

Pickney of Maryland said, in 1789, 'is at the foundation of republican institutions,' has greatly diminished among us, owing to our acquiescence in the system of slavery. We do not fear, he continued, that this Committee will recommend that our Legislature will enact a penal law against abolitionists. But we do apprehend that condemnatory resolutions may be prepared and passed—and these we should deprecate more even than a penal law, for reasons which we wish to give to this Committee.

[Here the Committee conferred together.]
Mr. Moseley said—I wish all the information I can get on this subject. I hope nothing will preclude a hearing. I must act in relation to it, and am now in a great degree ignorant. I wish to know how far abolitionism goes;—what it is tending to do,—and what it is. Though I am opposed to the measures of the abolitionists, yet no opinions from a respectable body of men are unworthy of regard.

Mr. Lucas withdrew his objection.
Mr. May then proceeded to give some sketch of the origin and history of the abolition movements. The feeling of opposition to slavery had its origin in that principle of our nature, which leads us to sympathize with the oppressed. He illustrated by a reference to the Poles, &c. He then stated that this feeling for the slaves had led to the formation of the New England Anti-Slavery Society. It consisted of a band of men associated to overthrow the system of American slavery, by all the intellectual moral power they possessed. This object they had no desire to keep secret.

Mr. May was proceeding to give a sketch of the evils of slavery social, political and moral, which had roused the Abolitionists to the efforts they are making.

Mr. Lunt, the chairman, here interposed, and said that there was but one opinion on that point, and that such remarks were unnecessary.

Mr. May resumed and gave a description of several important documents, which he presented to the committee. He explained what is meant by immediate emancipation;—defended the publications from the charge of incendiarism, and spoke of the distribution of their publications by mail. If the Liberator is incendiary, if the Declaration of Independence is incendiary, then are our anti-slavery documents. If they are incendiary, why is not the incendiary matter pointed out to us? Why, in calling on the northern legislators to put down the abolitionists, are not specific charges brought against us, and the criminal documents furnished? As to the distribution, no publication has been sent by the society to any colored man south of Washington. They are sent to the masters.

Mr. Lucas. You say, Mr. M., that the only weapons you use, or intend to use, are moral weapons. Are these things of that description—showing him several of the pictures in the Anti-Slavery Record, which Mr. M. had laid before the committee among other documents—are such things, which are evidently calculated to irritate the slaveholders, are these things a part of your moral weapons?

Mr. May. They are, sir. Surely one of the means by which we may hope to effect a moral reformation is the exposure of the sin, from which we aim to reform the community. Pictorial representation is a very fair means of exposing the evil—and we make use of it—and consider it a moral weapon.

Mr. Lucas then quoted from memory some expression, used by a man of ardent feelings, which, out of its connection, seemed to refer to something more than moral suasion.

Mr. May. I do not remember to have seen that expression. I do not like it, but it is not insurrectionary. I do not say, sir, that there have not been in our publications some sentences in bad taste and some in bad temper; but I do deny that there have been any, exciting the slaves or their friends to insurrection.

Mr. Lunt. You said, Mr. May, that though you had not sent your publications to people of color, yet that you did not disclaim the right to do it, if you thought best.

Mr. May. I did say so—because we regard the slaves as men, who may be always treated as men—and because there is nothing in our publications designed or adapted to rouse them to insurrection. On the contrary, they uniformly condemn a resort to violence. But for reasons which we deem sufficient, we have not and shall not send our publications to the slaves, nor to the free colored people. These reasons, sir, are given in our last Annual Report. [Mr. M. here read from the report, pp. 17, 18.]

Ellis Gray Loring, Esq. rose and said, that the abolitionists appeared before the Committee, in consequence of the paragraph in his Excellency's Message said to allude to them and their measures, and to interpose a remonstrance against the legislative action recommended in the Resolutions, which had been transmitted from several of the southern states, on the subject of slavery. We have respectfully claimed to be heard in answer to the charges against us, and your Committee have assigned us this time and place for that purpose. Our principles and measures are brought before you, and we would ask a patient hearing in their defence—or at least in arrest of judgment.

[One of the Committee. Do you intimate, Mr. Loring, that our verdict is made up against you?]

Mr. L. continued. I hope not—for we feel a strong interest in the decision of this Committee. A report by them in favor of laws against the free discussion of slavery—or in favor of resolutions censuring the abolitionists, would be felt by us as a deep injury. We think we have a right to ask of the Committee and of the Legislature to stand neutral between us and our opposers. Give us a fair field and no favor, and if we do not prevail, it is because the right is not with us.

We have felt it our duty to plead for the enslaved in our land. The general duty of sympathizing with and succoring the oppressed, will probably be conceded. I feel bound to begin thus far back, for we have fallen on times, when first principles are daily questioned, and we are required to demonstrate the very axioms of morals. What then is to limit our exercise, as abolitionists, of this duty and this right? I have heard of but one reply. The relations we bear to the oppressor, control, it is said, our duty to the oppressed. Let us, then, examine these relations, and see where in we have in our publications or discussions violated 'the divine right' of the slaveholder. If we are bound to abstain from the exercise of our moral right, in the discussion of slavery with a view to its overthrow, it must be either because we are restrained by the principles of international law, or by the Constitution of the United States, or by the laws of our own State. On the principles of international law, I need not enlarge on this occasion. The application of those principles between the states of this Union, however familiar the process may be among our neighboring brethren of the South, will not find much favor in this Commonwealth. But grant the States to be foreign nations as to each other; still, nothing is gained to our opposers. We have, to be sure, an act of the United States against fitting out armaments to attack nations, with whom we are at peace; but the exertion of a moral power in favor of the enslaved

ought not, and is not, to be so repressed. Those of us here who heard the thrilling eloquence of Faneuil Hall, when the Polish Standards were dedicated to the cause of freedom, or who listened ten years since to the spirit-stirring appeals of our scholars and statesmen, in behalf of the down-trodden Greeks, reeked little of their 'international obligations' to 'our ancient allies,' the sultan, or the czar. It is impossible gravely to argue such a position.

Is it then in the Constitution of the United States that this restriction on our liberty of speech is to be looked for? And if so, are we to find our condemnation in its letter or in its spirit? I find there an abundant guaranty for the liberty of speech; but I look in vain, in the letter of the constitution, for any prohibition of the use of moral means, for the extirpation of slavery. The word slave does not stain its pages, and there are but three allusions to the subject, in the whole instrument. The first is in the clause authorizing slave representation in Congress. I war not with this arrangement. It forbids me not to speak my mind of slavery. The second is the article which prohibits Congress from forbidding the migration or importation of such persons as the states shall admit, (meaning by this the foreign and domestic slave-trade) until the year 1808;—and the third is the clause, which requires us to send back into slavery the poor being who has escaped from the hand of his master. What is there in all this which prevents my testifying against slavery? How much is there not in it which calls on me to speak. If the southern slaves should forcibly assert those rights which our fathers proclaimed to be the birthright of all men equally,—liberty, and the means of happiness,—you and I, Mr. Chairman, are legally liable, (under the clause in the Constitution relating to the suppression of domestic insurrection) to be drafted in the militia, in order to force down their throats with the bayonet, the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence! And if slavery bring upon me this horrible obligation, am I to be denied the poor right of talking about it? If I am bound by the Acts of the United States under the heaviest penalties, to drive from my door the poor fugitive who implores my protection,—if I am obliged, as a magistrate, against the express law of God, to sign the warrant for his delivery to his southern task-master, such obligations give me at least the right to remonstrate.

No, Mr. Chairman, we hear much of a 'Compact,' which binds me to hold my tongue on slavery;—but where am I to find it? So grave an infringement of our general right of discussion, if it exist, should certainly be very plainly set down. Any law or regulation on this subject is penal in its character, and I demand that its terms be expressed, and that it be most strictly construed. But the truth is, no such prohibition is to be found at all. There is not one word said on the subject, in the Constitutions or laws under which we live. The continuance of slavery in the Southern States is, politically speaking, among the reserved rights of those States. The only conclusion from this is, that neither Congress nor the Legislatures of other States can legislate on slavery for any State in which it exists. All this I readily grant, nor do I ever hear it disputed by any man. But what has this to do with our efforts to overthrow slavery by moral means? Slavery, in this respect, stands on precisely the same ground with Lotteries, Intemperance, and other matters of domestic regulation. They are subjects of the reserved rights of the States, and can be acted on, for legal purposes, only by the local legislatures. But who in his senses would pretend that this fact limits the exertion of our moral influence? That it would be, for example, a violation of the Constitution of the U. S., to discuss in Massachusetts the subject of Lotteries or Intemperance—the Pennsylvania Lottery for instance, or the effect of Albany Ale—or to send tracts on these subjects into other States? What would have been thought, when South Carolina was arming herself against the General Government, of a proposition to punish the Managers of our Peace Society, for sending into that State discussions as to the unlawfulness of war, or descriptions of its horrors?

We do not claim to legislate. We wish no man to fight, even if oppressed. It is known that the abolitionists, as a class, hold the peaceful opinions of the Quakers,—but we are willing to trust our cause to the foolishness of preaching. Give us our choice, and we would, ten-fold, rather have the peaceful power of affecting public sentiment on any moral question, by argument, entreaty, description, reproof—than to be girded with the sword, or attended by the posse comitatus. Such is our opinion, and fanatical though it be called, it has been the fanaticism of every victorious reform.

But it is said, our proceedings are contrary to the Spirit of the Constitution. And is it then true that the Spirit of our Constitution is the Spirit of Slavery? We then unto us, for 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty.' What becomes of our boast of living under a 'free government'—of enjoying 'free institutions'? Was then our solemn appeal and justification before the nations, in the Declaration of Independence, only a piece of hypocrisy or rhodomontade? No, Sir, our heroic fathers would not have listened to such a supposition. Washington's recently published letters shew him to have been a warm friend to emancipation: ay, Sir, and an admiring eulogist of immediate emancipation as exemplified by Lafayette on his plantation in Cayenne. Jefferson's writings contain more appalling descriptions, and more bitter denunciations of Slavery, than the abolition publications of our day,—and Franklin, Rush and John Jay were members of the first Anti-Slavery Society in this country, a Society whose avowed purpose was the abolition of slavery in all the States of this Union and which actually petitioned Congress, for that object. These great men formed our Constitution, and must be supposed to have known something of its spirit. And yet they never found there any prohibition of writing and speaking against slavery. I believe there was not one of our eminent statesmen of that period, who would not have repudiated with scorn the idea that the Constitution of the U. S. was to deprive any man in the country of the right to exercise his pen and his tongue against Slavery. Is there a man who hears me that doubts this? Sir, it has been reserved for the acumen of our own day to discover that in a free country, the blessings and the principles of freedom are the only subject in Heaven or earth that cannot properly be discussed.

We do not conceal our solicitude, Mr. Chairman, to have your Committee report against any legislative action. We think you must come to the conclusion that the Legislature has nothing to do with our efforts, any more than with those of any other philanthropic association. Still, standing here upon our defence, we ought to suppose and be prepared for the worst. Your committee may recommend the passage of penal laws against the abolitionists, or the adoption of resolutions of censure on their proceedings. I am happy to have heard it remarked by one gentleman on the Committee (Mr. Lucas) that it was impossible the Legislature should pass laws against our publications, as

such laws would be a palpable infraction of the constitution of this Commonwealth. This conclusion seems so obvious, that I shall refrain from arguing on it. I need only add, that whether such laws would be constitutional or not, they seem, at the present stage of the question, at best, unnecessary. The southern states make certain general charges against the abolitionists. As far as we can understand them, we deny their truth and their application. We deny that we have ever sent our publications among the slaves, or to any free blacks in the southern states.—We deny that we have ever preached or encouraged the doctrine of physical resistance on the part of the slaves. No evidence is brought of the truth of the loose allegations against us. What need is there, then, for action? Surely the Legislature will require that some wrong be shown, before they begin to devise a remedy.

But if legislation is unnecessary, resolutions of censure from the Legislature, or your Committee, would be far worse, for they would be unjust. Give us the gag laws, and we will submit or take the consequences. But do not sit in judgment upon our past acts. I fully recognize your right, as private individuals, to hold meetings, and to pass resolutions on us or our measures as you may think they deserve—but I do deny your right as a legislature, or a committee, to do any such thing. You were sent here to exercise a different trust—to make laws for the future—not to pronounce judgment on the past. What right can the Legislature have to censure the past doings of the Abolition Societies, any more than of the Temperance Societies or the Peace Society? The fact of the southern states having taken umbrage at our proceedings cannot, of itself, give you any jurisdiction over them. You may assume this power, but I respectfully submit that it would be a usurpation of power not rightfully belonging to you. Any censure from your Committee or from the Legislature would, I repeat, be unjust, for, in whatever shape that censure may be disguised, an official censure is, and it will be understood to be, in effect a punishment. It is in substance, if not in form, a punishment. I appeal to the common sense and candor of every honest man here, whether this be not so. Now, Sir, I call for the authority under which this Legislature will undertake to inflict punishment—even the slightest—on the citizens of this Commonwealth for an offence unknown to our laws, and in the absolute destitution of all proof, but mere vague rumor.

[Mr. Lunt here said, do you undertake, Mr. L., to call these resolutions from the south, mere vague rumor?]

Yes, Sir, continued Mr. Loring, the southern resolutions deserve no better designation. They are certainly not evidence, and they lack every requisite of a distinct and intelligible charge. No man can plead here, or would be bound in a court of law, to plead to such loose and general statements of an offence, as are contained in these documents from the south. If we were indicted for the pettiest offence, it would be necessary to set forth our crime with great particularity of time, and place, and circumstance. What are the circumstances of our offence? When and where was it committed? Wherein does it consist? Where is the allegation, that it is 'against the form of the statute in such case made and provided'? I call for the chapter and section of that same statute.

[One of the Committee remarked that an indictment sometimes concludes 'contra pacem.']
True, the indictment may run 'against the peace,' &c., but remember, it must be 'against the peace of this Commonwealth.' Such is not the charge against us. We have not broken the peace of this Commonwealth. If we have, the Courts of law are open. We have only broken the peace of the enslaver of his brethren. As well might we be indicted in Massachusetts, for uttering our sympathies and our prayers for Poland, on the ground that it would be 'against the peace' of the Emperor Nicholas. 'There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked.'

I protest in the name of justice and freedom against your awarding a punishment, not preceded by the forms of trial. I protest still more strongly against your interfering with the regular administration of justice in the Courts. Are the laws insufficient? make new ones. Have we offended against the existing laws? Give us then a fair chance before a jury of our country. The legal profession and the community have recently been astounded with certain novel doctrines which hold it to be an offence to express any sentiments 'having a tendency' to create 'dissatisfaction' with their condition, in the minds of men deprived of freedom; and I have even heard of its being asserted, that the proceedings of the abolitionists are 'indictable at common law.' Here then is reason to pause. If the abolitionists are to hold up their hands, as culprits, before a jury of their country, for what they have heretofore done, I ask that they may do it, unprejudiced by any *ex post facto* action of the Legislature. Give them, at least, a fair trial, when it comes.

There is, as I conceive, in no view, any present call for action, on the part of the Legislature. Let us alone, to fight out our good fight of faith with our lawful weapons. Leave us our right to use argument, entreaty, rebuke, remonstrance—ay, Sir, and invective too, if we think it right and useful—in our warfare against slavery. We have the north to convert as well as the south. Truth speaks in many tones—silence none of them.

A great principle is involved in the decision of the Legislature. I esteem as nothing, in comparison, our feelings or wishes as individuals. Personal interests sink into insignificance, here. Sacrifice us if you will, but do not wound liberty through us. Care nothing for men, but let the oppressor and his apologist, whether at the north or the south, beware of the certain defeat which attends him who is found fighting against God.

Mr. Goodell.—When we hear the high, despotic demands of the southern States, and find so many men of property and standing at the north, co-operating with them to put down the discussion of a subject, which is manifestly one of fearful importance to our country; when we see publications, issued from the press in this city, by men of high respectability, in which is propounded the monstrous doctrine, that the utterance of anti-slavery sentiments and the formation of Anti-Slavery Societies, are offences punishable at common law;—and when we find the Governor of the Commonwealth himself, giving his countenance to these alarming encroachments upon the liberty of speech and of the press, we have every thing to fear. We earnestly hope the Legislature of this state will not give its sanction to the measures, which have been pursued thus far, to prevent the discussion of a subject of vital consequence, which has in fact already been let alone too long.

We would deprecate the passage of any condemnatory resolutions by the Legislature, even more than

the enactment of a penal law, for in the latter case we should have some redress. We could plead the unconstitutionality of such a law; at any rate, it could not take effect until we had had a fair trial. Nor is it for the injurious operation of such an extra-judicial sentence. Besides, we believe, it is pretty well understood, that the people are not yet prepared to receive a law, that shall operate to infringe the liberty of speech. Our opposers must operate indirectly.

Let the Legislature of Massachusetts set the example of passing a formal censure upon the abolitionists, and anti-slavery Societies, and it would be a signal for a general legislative condemnation of them, all over the land. What next? The passage of such resolutions by this and other Legislatures, would help to fix in the public mind the belief, that abolitionists are a dangerous body of men—and prepare the public to receive such a law as the slaveholding states might dictate.

We would solemnly protest against a legislative censure, because it would be a usurpation of an authority, never entrusted to the Legislature. They are not a judicial body—and have no right to pronounce the condemnation of any one.

Mr. Lunt.—You must not indulge in such remarks, Sir. We cannot sit here, and permit you to instruct us as to the duties of the Legislature.

Mr. Goodell resumed. We have three pleas to offer against the passage of any condemnatory resolutions. First—we have abundance of facts to prove that the charges alleged against us are not true. We have not done any thing contrary to the law. The Constitution of the United States secures to us the right to do all we have done or intend to do.

[We forbear to give more of Mr. Goodell's able argument, as the whole of it is embodied in a very valuable pamphlet just issued, which was written by him, entitled, 'A Full Statement of the reasons which were in part offered to the Committee of the Legislature on the 4th and 8th of March, why there should be no penal law enacted, and no censure passed by the Legislature upon Abolitionists and Anti-Slavery Societies.' To that excellent document we refer our readers for a most lucid exposure of the argument against any concurrence, on the part of our General Court, with the demands of the southern States.]
Mr. Garrison next addressed the Committee in a brief, but very forcible speech. We regret that we were not able to preserve the whole of it. It is said, Mr. Chairman, that the Abolitionists wish to destroy the Union. It is not true. We would save the Union, if it be not too late. But to us it would seem that the Union is already destroyed. We have no Union. We, Sir, cannot go through these States enjoying the privileges, which the Constitution of the Union professes to secure to all the citizens of this Republic. And why? Because, Sir, and only because, we are laboring to accomplish the very purposes, for which it is declared in the preamble to the Constitution, that the Union was formed! Because we are laboring to establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, and promote the general welfare!

Mr. Follen next addressed the Committee. He commenced with a series of remarks upon the rights of man, which the people of this country profess to hold in the most sacred regard. Thence he proceeded to make some highly intelligent observations upon the spirit and purpose of our republican institutions; and to show that the liberty of speech and of the press was essential to the preservation of our government. Whatever will not bear to be examined, criticised, spoken about, written about, must be essentially bad, and ought not to be perpetuated. The attempt to stifle the voice—or to muzzle the press is a sure indication of an attempt to perpetuate what ought to be abolished. Such an attempt is now under consideration. By the exercise of their natural and constitutional right to speak and print what they think of the evils and dangers of Slavery, the Abolitionists are endeavoring to effect its overthrow. This the slaveholders and their abettors are determined to prevent, not by showing them that they are mistaken, and trying to convince them that slavery is a good and not an evil; but by denying their right to express any opinion about it. They have done all in their power to excite the public odium against the abolitionists, and make it to be believed that those who denounce slavery are the enemies of this republic—of these free institutions! Southern legislatures have offered rewards for their abduction or for their assassination—and are now calling upon the northern legislatures to abolish the abolitionists by law. We do not apprehend, gentlemen of this committee, that you will advise, or that the Legislature of this Commonwealth will enact a law making it penal in the citizens of Massachusetts to denounce slavery. But we do apprehend that you may recommend, and that the Legislature may pass resolutions censuring the abolitionists. Now against this measure we most earnestly protest. The consequences of a legislative censure we think might be worse than of a penal law. We need only look back a few months, to see what consequences we may apprehend. The outrages committed in this city upon the liberty of speech—the mobs in Boston were doubtless contained and encouraged by the Faneuil Hall meeting. A large number of the citizens of Boston met there. The resolutions they passed were such as the Abolitionists themselves would readily assent to—but the preamble contained a severe censure, and this we believe was regarded by the mobocrats, (though not intended by the meeting at Faneuil Hall) as a warrant for their outrageous proceedings. Now, gentlemen, may we not reasonably anticipate, that similar consequences would follow the expression by the Legislature of a similar condemnation? Would not the mobocrats again undertake to execute the informal sentence of the General Court? Would they not let loose again their bloodhounds upon us?

Mr. Lunt. Stop Sir. You may not pursue this course of remark. It is insulting to this committee, and to the Legislature, which they represent.

Dr. Follen. I have not intimated nor do I believe, Sir, that you or the Legislature would approve an act of violence. I have only endeavored to show you, from what has been, what may be.

Mr. Lunt. The Committee consider the remarks you have made very improper, and cannot permit you to proceed.

Dr. Follen sat down—and although there was scarcely any moving about the house there was evidently a deep emotion of displeasure. It was apparent enough that few, if any present, felt the reasonableness of the Chairman's procedure. Mr. Moseley of Newburyport, one of the Committee, remonstrated with Mr. Lunt. A few minutes were occupied by the Committee in conference with each other.

Mr. May. I should be unfaithful to my own convictions of right, to my associates, and to the sacred cause of freedom, for which we have come here, if I were to depart without declaring explicitly my utter dissatisfaction with the course pursued by this Committee. We asked leave to appear at this board, and show reasons, why there should be no legislative cen-

* With the exception of three colored subscribers to the *Emancipator*, in the city of Washington, as mentioned in Mr. May's remarks.

after case we
end the un-
ite, it could
be. Not so
redress
extra-judicial
ly well un-
pared to re-
the liberty
directly.
at the exam-
abolitionists,
a signal for
all over the
to fix in
are a dan-
able to re-
states might
a legislative
of an an-
ure. They
to pronounce
ch remarks,
to instruct
e pleases to
atory resolu-
to prove
a true. We
law. The
to us the
o.
is able ar-
a very val-
written by
he reasons
titude of the
why there
nature pass-
and Anti-
ment we
of the argu-
of our Gen-
States.]
mittee in a
et that we
It is said,
to destroy
the Un-
seem that
no Union,
enjoying the
Union pro-
Republic.
se, we are
for which it
tion, that we
are laboring
tranquility,
mittee. Ho
the rights
profess to
be proceed-
upon insti-
tutions;
of the press
government.
criticized,
stiffly bad,
attempt to
a sure in-
ought to be
considered
constitu-
think of the
are enslave-
ment, not
and trying
and not an
any opin-
or power to
by those free
offered res-
mination—
istrates to
not appre-
will advo-
wealth citi-
of we do ap-
the Legis-
abolition-
earnestly
easure
law. We
what con-
ages com-
speech—the
and en-
A large
ere. The
abolitionists
the prem-
e believe
not so la-
a warrant
gentlemen,
their conse-
legisla-
the mob-
mal sen-
may not let
cursus this
committee.
nt.
I believe,
ove an act
show you,
he remarks
not permit
there was
e was evi-
was appa-
the reason-
own con-
the sacred
here, if I
my utter
this Com-
board, and
lative cen-

also be informed whether our right to speak here is to be recognized by the committee, or whether we are still to be considered as being permitted to speak by special favor.

[The chairman declined making any satisfactory explanations—and Dr. Follen therefore declined to proceed.]

After a few moments consultation with the representatives of the Anti-Slavery Society—Mr. May said to the Committee, We have concluded, gentlemen, to occupy your attention no longer at this time. We shall present a remonstrance to the Legislature to-morrow morning, and hope hereafter to be permitted to meet you, with a better understanding of our rights.

SECOND INTERVIEW.

On the morning of the 5th of March a remonstrance was presented, by the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, to the Senate and House of Representatives, against the demands of the south, and against any action of the Legislature in accordance with those demands—concluding with the request, that the right of the petitioners to be heard before the Committee might be recognized, and they be permitted to appear and show reasons, why there should be no penal law enacted, and no resolutions passed, censuring the Abolitionists and Anti-Slavery Societies. The remonstrance was read in both branches of the Legislature and referred to the same Committee. On the 7th, the chairman of the Committee informed the Corresponding Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, that the Committee would meet the Abolitionists again on the afternoon of the 8th. Accordingly, at the time appointed, the Committee sat in the Hall of the Representatives, and a numerous audience, partly composed of ladies, attended the proceedings.

Mr. May commenced by saying he expected another gentleman, Dr. Follen; would have been there to address the Committee first; but as that gentleman had not yet arrived, he would occupy their attention a few minutes. Whether right or wrong in our opinion, said he, we abolitionists do regard the enslavement of millions in our country as a most awful sin, and a most alarming evil. It seems to us that slavery is not only doing the greatest injuries to those who suffer, and to those who inflict the wrong, but it is steadily destroying the peace and harmony of the Union, sapping the very foundations of the Republic. We have come to perceive that slavery must be abolished, or we shall be ruined. Liberty, with all the blessings of a free government, will depart from us. We have too much faith in the over-ruling providence of a righteous God—and too clear a recollection of the history of past ages, to believe that we shall long escape the destruction, which has always overtaken nations, that have persisted in the sin of oppression. It therefore appears to us, that we have a duty to perform—that we are bound to attempt, at least, to save our country from ruin. True, other men, wiser and better than ourselves, do not think and feel as we do—but we cannot regulate our conduct by other men's consciences. 'Tis true also, that the most respectable people in the community are opposed to the anti-slavery enterprise. But then we know that people of that class have never been forward in reform. The greatest reformations, that have blessed the world, have been begun by persons of little note, perhaps poor and despised. These recollections encourage us to go on, and do all we can to deliver the oppressed from bondage, and avert the evils that impend over our guilty land. We have therefore formed societies, we have established periodicals, we have sent out agents—the design of all which is to arouse our nation to a consciousness of the abominable wickedness, which is in our midst. And now our Legislature is called on by the south, to suppress our efforts—to make our proceedings to be penal offences.

I shall confine my remarks to two points. First, I shall contend that our publications are not incendiary, nor insurrectionary. Secondly, that if they were, we have not sent them to the slaves—we have not distributed them in such a manner as to warrant the charge, that we are endeavoring to create an insurrection.

1. Our publications are not incendiary, nor insurrectionary. What is the meaning of incendiary? If I know, it means, tending to excite to evil, to sedition. Insurrectionary means, tending to excite to violent and murderous attempts to throw off the yoke of oppression, or the authority of government. Now, sir, I insist that neither of these epithets can, with any propriety, be applied to the publications of the abolitionists. I appeal to them all. I do not deny that many are intended to be, and are exciting. But I deny that any of them are intended, nor do I think they are adapted, to excite the people to do evil, to commit violence, unless it be in opposition to ourselves. Those who are doing the deeds of darkness hate the light, and hate those who expose them to it. Nevertheless their deeds should be repressed. We are aiming in the first place to expose the wickedness of our country, to bring it to the light, that it may be seen and abhorred. We have endeavored—we shall endeavor still more, to arouse the people to this crying iniquity—to excite their feelings of commiseration for the enslaved; but we never have intended to excite any evil feelings, unless it be an evil feeling to abhor injustice, oppression, cruelty. We have endeavored to excite this feeling. We would, if we could, fill every bosom in the land with the utmost abhorrence of slaveholding—making property of men—reducing rational and moral beings to the condition of mere brutes. But we would not excite the slaves, or their friends, to do any injury to the masters. Gentlemen, I confidently appeal to all the anti-slavery publications I am acquainted with. You will find in them uniformly an explicit and earnest disclaimer of all intention or right to resort to physical violence.

[Mr. M. here presented copies of a large number of publications, commenting upon them, and reading extracts from them, in confirmation of what he had said of their pacific spirit—particularly copies of the papers which were burnt with so much fury at Charleston, S. C.]

But the pictures, Mr. Chairman, the pictures we have published, have given the greatest offence, and have been pronounced incendiary. I have brought copies of them, that the Committee may see and judge for themselves whether they deserve that title. Here, for instance, is the picture of a kneeling slave. It is very coarsely executed—so much so as to be almost a caricature. But what, sir, is the sentiment of the picture? Does it look like violence or insurrection? Is the kneeling posture, the attitude of one about to assault his enemy? And these chained arms, do they look like fighting? And these well-known, touching lines of Cowper—the Negro's Complaint—or the equally beautiful verses of our beloved Whittier—do these contain any counsel to violence? Read them, Mr. Chairman—read them, gentlemen. They are very exciting, but they are by no means insurrectionary.

[Mr. May went on to exhibit several other pic-

tures—the Tree of Liberty—in which is exhibited on the one side the effects of free, and on the other the effects of slave labor. Illustrations of the speeches made in Faneuil Hall—a sheet on which are six pictures, representing horrible scenes of daily occurrence in this land of liberty. Also a large sheet containing sketches of several of the slaveholding establishments in the District of Columbia. And lastly, a picture copied by an American artist from one executed in England, illustrative of the emancipation of the slaves in the British West Indies on the 1st of August, 1834.]

Now, gentlemen, we wish you to look at these pictures, and those in the small pamphlets I laid before you, and decide for yourselves which of them is incendiary or insurrectionary. They are very exciting. I know—it is for this reason we make use of them. Many minds and hearts are more immediately and deeply affected by a pictorial representation, than by a verbal description. These pictures are intended for the north rather than the south, where the shocking originals of these pictures are to be found. But some of them have been sent to the south, that our brethren there may know what we are doing here, to expose the American system of slavery, and to excite a general abhorrence of it. We have no wish to conceal from them any thing we are doing, or intend to do.

2. If it could be shown that our publications and prints are, in any sense of the words, insurrectionary—still I insist that we have not distributed them in such a manner as to warrant the charge, that we are endeavoring to create an insurrection. We have not sent them to the slaves, nor to the free people of color at the south, for the reasons which I stated last week. We have sent them, as I stated at our former interview—we have sent them to men of standing and influence, in the communities where they reside—to ministers of all denominations, to members of the state and national legislatures, to judges and justices, and to men whose names we have obtained from the Registers. If some slaves have seen the pictures, or have read the publications we have sent to their masters, this has been incidental and not a part of our plan. Our object and endeavor are to exhibit to the slaveholders and those who are co-operating with them to perpetrate the despotism of our republic, the awful consequences of slavery, and the certain destruction which will overwhelm this nation, if we do not speedily depart from this iniquity. Light and liberty are but very partially diffused over the southern states; and efforts are now making to restrict their diffusion over the northern states. At the south, excepting on the elevated places of society, excepting the favored few, the population are walking in moral and intellectual darkness—no system of general education is established there, and the means of religious instruction are very partially provided. The mass of the people, white as well as black, are alarmingly ignorant and awfully licentious. At the north, we find that the people have already been repressed by the pro-slavery party, to commit violence upon the most sacred rights of men and citizens—yes, to trample under foot the palladium of our liberties. It is now evident to all, that slavery must be abolished, or we shall all be slaves, or little better than slaves.

Dr. Follen, (late Professor in Harvard University) addressed the Committee. He said he had been eleven years a resident, and six years a citizen of this Republic. The principles on which the Anti-Slavery Societies were founded, were the same which brought him to this country, and without the enjoyment of which he could not wish to remain in it. The principle of freedom, and especially the right of free discussion, were secured to the citizen in the Constitution and laws of the country. The principle of freedom of speech was the only point really at issue before the Committee of the Legislature. It was proposed, through the medium of this Committee, to recommend to the Legislature either penal enactments, or a vote of censure against the Abolitionists, and for what? Simply for the exercise of the freedom of speech and the press, not only without any violation of law, but clearly within the law and the Constitution. In no case, said Dr. F., has it been pretended that aught but speaking and printing, has ever been attempted by abolitionists to accomplish the objects they have in view. We are to be censured, if at all, by the Legislature, not for what we have done, but for what we believe and say, though there is no law, and no law can be made under the Constitution, against which we have offended. We have endeavored by persuasion, by argument, by moral and religious appeals, to urge upon the Nation, and especially upon our Southern brethren, the necessity of freeing themselves from the stain of slavery, which rests upon our institutions. This is all that we have done, and what we shall continue to do. What is there so singular in this, that the Abolitionists of this country should be marked for Legislative censure? It is now admitted that the voice of the civilized world, out of this country, is with the Abolitionists. The civilized nations of Europe, have already done or are fast doing, what must be done in this country, at some time or other. Emancipation must come. Mr. Jefferson prophesied truly when he said many years ago, that an end to slavery must come. Whether it shall come in peace, by argument and persuasion, or in blood, as it did in St. Domingo, rests upon ourselves to determine. The Abolitionists, feeling in the spirit of the prophecy of Jefferson, that emancipation must come, seek to bring it about in peace, by rousing the country to a sense of the dangers growing out of this institution, and increasing, so long as it remains among us. If we are told we must not discuss it now, we ask? when will the time come to discuss it? When will the South be better prepared than she is now, for the discussion? On this point, I will quote the language of a Southern man and a slaveholder, Mr. Summers of Virginia, who, in his speech on slavery, in the Legislature of Virginia, in 1832, said:

"Sir, the evils of this system cannot be enumerated. It was unnecessary to attempt it. They glare upon us at every step. When the owner looks to his wasted estate, he knows and feels them. When the statesman examines the condition of his country, and finds her moral influence gone, her physical strength diminished, her political power waning, he sees and must confess them. Will gentlemen inform us when this subject will become less delicate than it will be attended with fewer difficulties than at present—and at what period we shall be better enabled to meet them? Shall we be more adequate to the end proposed, after the resources of the State have been yet longer paralyzed by the withering, desolating influence of our present system? Sir, every year's delay but augments the difficulties of this great business, and weakens our ability to compass it. Like silly children, we endeavor to postpone the work, which we know must be performed."

These are the doctrines of the abolitionists. I might quote from the speeches of several other gentlemen of the Virginia Legislature, all holding the same doctrine, our doctrine, for which we are to be censured, perhaps punished by the Legislature of Massachusetts. And what more have we done than the members of the Virginia Legislature have themselves done? One of the States, which now requires you to pass laws to punish us for doing what they have done themselves, only we have not stated the case so strongly as was done by the members of the Legislature of Virginia, in 1832.

* See Mr. Preston's late speech in Congress.

I would not justify all the language used by abolitionists in their speeches and writings. Whenever they have been wrong, as I thought, I have censured them, I censure them now. But it would be impossible to belong to any party or body of men, if the whole were to be made responsible for every extravagant expression that might be uttered by an individual. Must every one who professes the same principle, because some one who professes the same is extravagant or intemperate in language? And especially, will the Legislature attempt to punish or censure freedom of speech, because some may use it improperly? We must, in all such cases, take the broad ground of right; freedom of speech and freedom of opinion, a right secured to us by the Constitution of the United States; and secured to us by the constitution of human nature. It is the only condition of improvement, the only safeguard of liberty. It is a right which cannot be taken from one class of citizens, without reaching all.

On this point alone, freedom of speech under the Constitution, are we assailed. You cannot censure freedom of speech in abolitionists, without preparing the way to censure it in any other class of citizens, who may for the moment be obnoxious to the majority. The question, therefore, is not whether you will put down the abolitionists, but it is whether the Legislature of Massachusetts will suppress freedom of speech forever? We say to you, save yourselves, as well as us from consequences which we must all bear alike. If, on this point, we give up the freedom of discussion. We apprehend also, and not without reason, personal consequences to ourselves, should any vote of censure be passed by the Legislature. Although I feel that many of my friends have been deeply injured by the unjust excitement which has been got up against them, founded on misrepresentation, yet I can look at it with the eye of a friend of the people. Even the mobs which have done so much discredit to the country in the estimation of the civilized world, I am glad to be able to believe, have acted on a delusion which had for its object, though mistaken, to preserve the Union. They believed we wanted to infringe the compact of the Constitution, by violent means, and destroy the Union. This was their error from the misrepresentations, made so often, of the designs and acts of the abolitionists. As a friend of liberty, I am glad to be able to look on the popular excitement, from which my friends have suffered, in this light, but where Judge Lynch has presided, I must say, as I said the other day—

Mr. Lunt—(Chairman of the Committee.)—I call you to order, sir. This is not respectful to the Committee.

[The call to order excited universal surprise, as from the peculiarly mild and gentlemanly address of Professor Follen, those who had been listening to him, could not comprehend the point of order. No one seemed more unaffectedly surprised than the Professor himself.—Reporter.]

Dr. Follen—I am not conscious of having said any thing disrespectful to the Committee. I beg to be informed in what I am out of order.

Mr. Lunt—It is not respectful to the Committee to allude to what you were called to order for, the other day.

Dr. Follen—I thought the other day I had been called to order for taking for granted that the Legislature would pass penal enactments, or a vote of censure, against the abolitionists. I do not understand why I am stopped now.

Mr. Lunt—Your allusion to mobs, for which you were called to order at the last session, is not proper.

Dr. Follen—Am I then to understand, that speaking disrespectfully of mobs is disrespectful to this Committee?

Mr. Lunt—Your allusion is not proper, and cannot be permitted.

Dr. Follen. Only allow me to have a distinct understanding of the objection. I have spoken, and was about to speak of the mobs where Lynch law has been practised. Is there any thing disrespectful in that to the Committee, or to the Legislature?

Mr. Lunt—I consider the allusion to mobs, in the manner I understand it to be made, implying that the action of the Legislature may sanction mobs, is improper, and cannot be permitted while I occupy this chair.

Mr. Mosely of Newburyport, (one of the Committee,) said he dissented wholly from the chair. He saw nothing in the allusion to mobs, disrespectful to the Committee or to the Legislature, and he considered that Dr. Follen was entirely in order.

Dr. Follen—If I have not the freedom of speech to speak of the evil consequences which we, as abolitionists, apprehend may follow a legislative censure, which may be used by interested and reckless men, as a sanction of mobs to assail us, then I have nothing more to say. If this is not allowed—if we cannot point out the direct or indirect tendency of legislative action, by a vote of censure, or otherwise, to incite mobs against us, then I have nothing more to say.

Mr. Lunt said, he would clear his skirts of this matter before the Legislature, and would take the opinion of the Committee, whether an allusion to mobs should be permitted.

Mr. Mosely (being asked his opinion) said he understood Dr. Follen to be explaining a point, deemed by his friends, as presenting a strong argument against any action of the Legislature. Here were communications from legislatures of several States, complaining of the conduct of a portion of our fellow-citizens, demanding legislative action, and requiring of us to pass penal laws against them. I understand that Dr. Follen and the other gentlemen desire to address the Committee, supposing they are the persons thus accused in the communications from southern legislatures. Now they wish to show that there has been misrepresentation of their acts and objects; that this misrepresentation has led to acts of personal violence against them, and that they apprehend, in case the Legislature should adopt resolves censuring them, that mobs would thereby be excited against them for unjust causes. This is one view they take of the consequences, which our acts may produce. Now if it can be shown that such may be the result of any act on the part of the Legislature, it appears to me to be directly relevant, and a matter of serious personal consequence to them. I am therefore willing to hear all they have to say. I do not say that I shall agree with their views, or act in conformity to their wishes, but I am ready to hear them through. I did not understand Dr. Follen to be out of order when he was stopped.

Mr. Lunt—The allusion was not only improper in itself, but such as no man, in a Court of Law, would be permitted to make.

Mr. Lucas and Mr. Corbett, two of the Committee, appeared silently to assent to the views of the Chairman, Mr. Lunt, who then said—I am happy to find that I am sustained by a majority of the Committee. It was decided that Dr. F. was out of order, and must not allude to mobs.

Mr. May here rose and called the attention of the Chairman to the Memorial, under which they now appeared before the Committee. The former interview they had with the Committee, was granted by the Chairman on application to him, but as it appeared to be regarded by the Chairman, as a matter of mere grace, and not of right, they had addressed a memorial to the Legislature, to be heard as a matter of right. The memorial was granted by being referred to this Committee; and it was the obvious intent of the Legislature, that the memorialists should be heard. He would read the memorial, which he did—

[The memorial concluded with a request to be permitted to show to the Committee why there should be no penal law enacted, and no condemnatory resolutions passed by the Legislature against the memorialists.] We have this permission, which we are now using, said Mr. May, and we can go no farther in this interview, unless Dr. Follen is permitted to proceed and show the effects likely to follow legislative action against us, as a reason why there should be no such action. Dr. Follen is speaking to that point which we deem important. If he is not permitted to use that as an argument, and others after him, our farther interview is of no use.

Mr. Lunt (the chairman) was understood to say—that the memorial being referred to the Committee, did not at all restrict the Committee as to the manner, in which the memorialists should be heard.

Mr. May—I presume we should not have been permitted by the Legislature to come here, on our request to be allowed to show cause why there should be no legislative action against us, unless it was intended we should have the liberty to do so. If such was not the intention, I am sorry they permitted us to come at all. It is the whole object for which we came here.

Mr. Lunt, after some consultation with the rest of the Committee, intimated that Dr. Follen might proceed.

Dr. Follen resumed—I understand that I am now allowed freely to speak of the 'injurious consequences, which we, as abolitionists, fear will be the result of any Legislative action against us. If this is not accorded to, then in the opinion of my friends, we have not the right of a full hearing, such as is granted in every Court of Law, and by every Legislature in the Union, before proceeding to pass any act that may injuriously affect a class of citizens, or the rights of individuals. If I am mistaken in this view of the subject, I wish to be stopped in the beginning, as I have no inclination to do any thing, which is contrary to the decision of the Committee.

Mr. Lunt—You can state what you apprehend, from any action of the Legislature.

Dr. Follen—I apprehend, then, from a vote of censure by the Legislature upon the sentiments and measures of the Abolitionists, the same consequences that have followed the expression of opinions condemning the abolitionists in another place. I allude to the meeting in Faneuil Hall, which was followed by a mob. That meeting had passed resolutions of censure, which had excited misapprehension of the real motives and designs of Abolitionists, and endangered their lives. I complained at that time, of the injustice done us, by representing us as designing to destroy the Union. To every one of the Resolutions adopted in that Hall, we can subvert, but the preamble to the Resolutions, of which we complain, spoke of the Abolitionists as holding opinions entirely opposite to those we maintain. We were held up to the public odium as disunionists.—What was the consequence? Persons thinking themselves justified and supported by many of the most respectable and influential men in the country, undertook to carry into effect the opinions expressed at the meeting in Faneuil Hall, by a mob. Individuals, peaceably and lawfully assembled, were assailed with violence, and put in peril of their lives. The rights of property were disregarded.—The sign of the Anti-Slavery Society was torn down and destroyed, and the spectacle was exhibited in the most enlightened and orderly city in the Union, of a mob, in the glare of day, leading an innocent man through the streets of Boston, with a halter about him. Yet not a single magistrate or court of Justice have taken cognizance of those acts of violence. I believe that those engaged in that outrage, are heartily sorry for the mob, and I wish to bury it in oblivion. I take no pleasure in alluding to it, and have only done so, as showing the consequences likely to follow measures, which may now be intended against the Abolitionists. Our view is, simply, that if a vote of censure should pass the Legislature, it might be followed by a repetition of the same outrages.

Might not the charge of exciting disunion, which we affirm is unjustly made against us, with more justice, be made against our assailants? The paper in this city, in which the mob was called to march under the banner of Judge Lynch, formerly defended Nullification, the fruit of which is discussion. There has been no call to legislate against that, and no censure is proposed.

We do not say that the Legislature will sanction mobs, or that they mean to incite them against us, but that we apprehend that mobs may follow any act of censure on their part, as they followed the votes of censure in the Faneuil Hall meeting. It is for the wisdom of the Legislature to determine whether the Abolitionists alone, are to be endangered by mobs. A mob excited against Abolitionists now, may excite another mob, far more dangerous to others than would be to us. It is impossible to prescribe limits to lawless acts of popular violence. If I were a man of property, I should fear nothing so much as a mob. The laws especially protect property and favor men of property, and it is only by maintaining the laws against violence in any form, that the rights of property can be secured in any community. A mob got up against Abolitionists, may stir up a mob against property. We would not rely on mobs. We should condemn them as much, if against our opponents, as against ourselves. We would let those rely on mobs, who cannot carry their measures by argument and law. We rely on the Legislature of Massachusetts to protect us, in common with all the citizens of the Commonwealth, while in the peaceful and lawful exercise of our right of freedom of speech.—Why then should we be censured for doing what the Legislature cannot declare to be an offence against law? There is nothing in the Constitution, which confers the power on the Legislature to pass censure upon citizens in the exercise of a legal right. It would combine judicial with legislative powers, which the Constitution expressly forbids. It would condemn citizens without being tried for any offence, and place them before the public, as if they were outlaws, not entitled to protection in their persons or property. I speak now of the consequences that are likely to follow a vote of censure by the Legislature. This is the only light in which I view the acts of popular violence that have taken place, and in which I wish to allude to them. I do it with pain and regret, but from necessity. Our aim is not to reproach any one, and we only seek, in using this argument, to impress upon the Legislature what we regard as a highly important reason, why they should not adopt a measure, the tendency of which is so obviously to incite to acts of violence against us.—Our wish therefore is, and we respectfully request the Legislature, that no action may be had on the subject, since the existing laws are sufficient to meet every emergency.

¶ The report of the proceedings before the Committee, has very much exceeded in length our expectations; and the parts of it were not sent to us in the order, in which they occurred. Mr. Sewall's compact and conclusive argument, which should have been inserted before Dr. Follen's remarks of the 24 day, must necessarily be omitted until the next week, and also Mr. Gould's, Dr. Bradford's and Mr. George Bond's remarks.

QUARTERLY MEETING OF THE MASS. ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Quarterly Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society will be held in Congress Hall, on Monday, the 28th of March, at 3 o'clock P. M. It is probable the meeting will be held, by adjournment, in the evening of the same day, at the same place.

¶ The friends of the cause throughout the State, and those who wish to understand our principles and measures, are respectfully invited to attend. HENRY E. BENSON, Rec. Sec.

A CARD.

The subscriber hereby expresses his grateful acknowledgments to the Ladies of the First Christian Society of Lynn, for twenty dollars, contributed by them to constitute him, their Pastor, a life member of the American Peace Society. P. R. RUSSELL.

Lynn, Feb. 11th, 1836.

STATEMENT, ETC.

JUST PUBLISHED, by the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. A Full Statement of the Reasons which were in part offered to the Committee of the Legislature of Massachusetts, on the Fourth and Eighth of March, showing why there should be no Penal Laws enacted, and no Condemnatory Resolutions passed by the Legislature, respecting Abolitionists and Anti-Slavery Societies. For sale at the Anti-Slavery Rooms, 46, Washington-street, (3d story.) Price 12 1/2 cents. March 15.

LITERARY.

HYMN.

Written by a gentleman of East Abington, and sung on the evening of the 9th inst., at which time the Abington Anti-Slavery Society was formed.

O, Thou, who from thy throne on high,
Dost deign to lend a listening ear
To the young ravens, when they cry,
O! condescend our voice to hear.

We, unto Thee, our crimes confess,
With our most aggravated sin
Of disregarding the distress
Of those who wear a darker skin.

Long hast thou blest our happy land
With Freedom's mild and cheering light;
May we, with cheerful heart and hand,
Extend to all, this sacred right.

May Freedom's universal reign
Fill earth, as waters fill the sea,
Break the oppressor's iron chain,
And let the oppressed all go free.

Then shall earth's darkest regions ring,
And shouts of joy shall rend the sky;
And all th' enslaved shall rise and sing,
'All glory be to God on high.'

THE LONELY HOME.

BY CHARLES SWAIN.

There's none to say 'good night' to me—
No friend my little life to share;
The old horse clock ticks drearily,
And makes the silence worse to bear.

Gone! All are gone! the fondest, best,
And loveliest, that I called my own;
After brief suffering they're at rest;
They—they lived not to wait alone!

Alone, alone—morning, noon, and eve,
I see the cold chairs keep their place;
I watch the dirty spider weave,
Where once there shone a household grace.

The brightness of my home is dull—
The busy faces all are gone;
I gaze—and oh! my heart is full—
My aching heart, that breaks alone!

I hope the Bible, gray with age—
The same my hapless grandmothers read;
But tears stain fast and deep that page
Which keeps their names—my loved—my dead.

The passing tread—the distant tone—
All human sounds but deepen more
The feeling I am lone—alone!
My cot with mantling ivy green,
Its pleasant porch, its sanded floor—
Ah! Time's tread touch hath changed the scene,
What was alas! is now no more!

The key hath rusted in the lock,
No longer since I the threshold crossed;
Why should I see the sun and mock
The blessed light my home hath lost?

Oh! would my last low bed were made!
But death forsakes the lone and old;
Seeks the blithe cheeks of youth to fade,
To crush the gay, the strong, the bold.

Yet sometimes through the long dull night,
When hours find supernatural tone,
I hear a promise of delight,
Then, God! thou leavest me not alone.

The winter rain fell fast and deep,
As slow a coffin past the road;
No mourner there was seen to weep—
No follower to that last abode!

Yet there a broken heart found peace—
The peace that but in death it knew;
Alas! that human loves increase
Our human woes and miseries too!

THANKSGIVING HYMN.

BY HENRY WARE, JR.

Father of earth and Heaven!
Whom angels uphold Creation!
To thee we raise the voice of praise,
And bend in adoration.

We praise the power that made us,
We praise the love that blesses us;
While every day that rolls away,
Thy gracious care confesses.

Life is from Thee, blest Father!
From thee our breathing spirits;
And thou dost give to all that live,
The bliss that each inherits.

Day, night, and rolling seasons,
And all that life embraces,
With bliss are crowned, with joy abound,
And claim our thankful praises.

Through trial and affliction,
May cast their dark shade o'er us
Thy love doth flow a heavenly glow,
Of light on all before us.

That love has smiled from heaven
To cheer our path of sadness,
And lead the way through earth's dull day,
To realms of endless gladness.

That light of love and glory
Has shone through Christ, the Saviour,
The holy Guide who lived and died,
That we might live forever.

And since thy great compassion
Thine brings thy children near Thee,
May we to praise devote our days,
And love, as well as fear thee.

And when death's final summons,
From earth's dear scenes shall move us,
From friends, from foes—from joys, from woes,
From all that know and love us;

Oh, then, let hope attend us!
Thy peace to us be given!
That we may rise above the skies,
And sing thy praise in heaven!

[From the Christian Spectator.]

HYMN.

Earth has a joy unknown in heaven,
The new-born joy of sin forgiven!
Tears of such pure and deep delight,
Ye Angels! never dream'd of your sight.

Ye saw of old, on chaos rise
The beauteous pillars of the skies:
Ye know where Morn, exulting, springs,
And evening folds her drooping wings.

Bright heralds of th' Eternal Will,
Abroad his errands ye fulfil;
Or thrond in floods of beaming day,
Symphonious, in his presence play.

Land is the song—the heavenly strain
Is shaken with the choral strain—
And dying echoes, floating far,
Draw music from each chiming star.

But I amid your choir shall shine,
And all your knowledge shall be mine;
Ye on your harps must learn to bear
A secret chord that mine will bear.

MISCELLANEOUS.

SLAVE MARKET AT NATCHEZ.

The following account of the mode of buying and selling slaves at the South, is from a work entitled 'The South West, by a Yankee.' Hall, Columbia, happy land!

I accompanied a friend, (a planter) to the slave market, which is situated about a mile from the city. It is composed of a cluster of rough wooden buildings, in the angle of two roads, in front of which, several saddle horses, either tied or held by servants, indicated a place of popular resort.

Alighting, we left our horses in charge of a neatly dressed yellow boy belonging to the establishment. Entering through a wide gate into a narrow court-yard, partially enclosed by low buildings, a scene of a novel character was at once presented. A line of negroes, commencing at the entrance with the tallest, who was no more than five feet eight or nine inches in height—for negroes are a low rather than a tall race of men—down to a little fellow of about ten years of age, extended in a semicircle around the right side of the yard. There were in all about forty. With their hats in their hands, which hung down by their side, they stood perfectly still, and in close order, while some gentlemen were passing from one to another examining for the purpose of buying. With the exception of displaying their teeth when addressed, and rolling their great white eyes about the court, they were so many statues of the most glossy ebony. As we entered the mart, one of the slave merchants approached us, saying, 'Good morning, gentlemen! Would you like to examine my lot of boys? I have as fine a line as ever came into market.' We approached them, one of us as a curious spectator, the other as a purchaser; and as my friend passed along the line, with a scrutinizing eye—giving that singular look peculiar to the buyer of slaves as he glances from head to foot over each individual—the passive subjects of his observations betrayed no other signs of curiosity than that evinced by an occasional glance. The entrance of a stranger into the mart is by no means an unimportant event to the slaves, for every stranger may soon become his master and command his future destinies. But slaves are seldom strongly affected by any circumstance, and their reflections never give them much uneasiness. To the generality of them, life is more animal existence, passed in physical exertion or enjoyment. This is the case with the field hands in particular, and more so with the females than the males, who through a long life seldom see any other person than their master or overseer, or any other gentleman's dwelling than the 'great house,' the 'white house' of these domestic empires in which they are subjects. To this class, a change of masters is a matter of indifference; they are handed from one to the other with the passiveness of a purchased horse. These constitute the lowest rank of slaves, and lowest grade in the scale of the human species.

'For what service particular did you want to buy?' inquired the trader, of my friend, 'A coachman.' 'There is one I think may suit you, sir,' said he; 'George step out here.' Forthwith a light colored negro, with a fine figure and good face, bating an enormous pair of lips, advanced a step from the line, and looked with some degree of intelligence, though with an air of indifference, upon his intended purchaser.

'How old are you, George?' he inquired. 'I don't recollect, sir, 'zactly—b'lieve I'm somewhere 'bout twenty-dree.' 'Where were you raised?' 'On master R—'s farm in Wirginny.' 'Then you are a Wirginny negro.' 'Yes, massa, me full blood Wirginny.' 'Did you drive your master's carriage?' 'Yes, massa, I drove ole missus' carage more dan four year.' 'Have you a wife?' 'Yes, massa, Ilef young wife in Richmond, but I got a new wife here in de lot. I wish you buy her massa, if you going to buy me.'

Then came a series of the usual questions from the intended purchaser. 'Let me see your teeth—your tongue—open your hands—roll up your sleeves—have you a good appetite?—are you good tempered?' 'Me got mad sometime,' replied George to the last query, 'but neber with my horses.' 'What do you ask for this boy, sir?' inquired the planter, after putting a few more questions to the unusually loquacious slave. 'I have held him at one thousand dollars, but I will take nine hundred and seventy-five cash.' The bargain was in a few moments concluded, and my companion took the negro at nine hundred and fifty, giving negotiable paper—the customary way of paying for slaves—at four months. It is, however, generally understood, that if servants prove unqualified for the particular service for which they are bought, the sale is dissolved. So there is in general perfect safety in purchasing servants untried, and merely on the warrant of the seller. George, in the meantime, stood by, with his hat in his hand, apparently unconcerned in the negotiations going on, and when the trader said to him, 'George, the gentleman has bought you; get ready to go with him,' he appeared gratified at the tidings, and smiled upon his companions, apparently quite pleased, and then bounded off to the buildings for his little bundle. In a few minutes he returned and took leave of several of his companions, who having been drawn up into line only to be shown to purchasers, were now once more at liberty, and moving about the court, all the visitors having left except my friend and myself. 'You mighty lucky, George,' said one congratulating him, 'to get sol so quick.' 'Oh, you neber min', Charley,' replied the delighted George; 'your turn come soon too.'

'You know who you massa be—what he live?' said another. 'Not zactly; he lib on plantation some whar he bout.' After taking leave of his companions, George came back in hand, very respectfully, to his purchaser, and said, 'Young massa you neber be sorry for buy George; I make you a good servant. But—good pardon, massa—but—if massa would be so good as buy Jane—' 'Who is Jane?' 'My wife since I come from Wirginny. She good wife and good girl—she good seamstress and good nurse—make de nice shirts and ebbery ting.'

'Where is she, George?' 'I here she be, massa,' said he, pointing to a bright mulatto girl, about eighteen, with a genteel figure and a lively countenance, who was waiting with anxiety the reply of the planter. Opposite to the line of males was also a line of females, extended along the left side of the court. They were about 20 in number, dressed in neat calico frocks, white aprons and caps, and fancy kerchiefs, tied in a mode peculiar to the negroes, upon their heads. Their whole appearance was extremely neat and tidy. They could not be disciplined to the grave silence observed by the males, but were constantly laughing and chattering with each other in suppressed voices, and appeared to take, generally, a livelier interest in the transactions in which all were equally concerned. The planter approached this line of female slaves, and inquired of the girl her capabilities as seamstress, nurse, and ironer. Her price was seven hundred and fifty dollars. He said he would take her to his family; and if the ladies were pleased with her, he would purchase her. The poor girl was as much delighted as though already purchased; and, at the command of the trader, went to prepare herself to leave the mart. Some other negroes were purchased, several of whom appeared merely powerful combinations of bone and muscle, and the only idea suggested in the mind, in gazing upon them, was of a remarkable physical energy. In the dull eye, and fleshy mouth there was no expression indicative of intellect.

ABOLITION DEBATE IN CONGRESS.

[Correspondence of the Boston Atlas.]

Washington, March 1, 1836.

The discussion upon the abolition question was resumed to-day in the Senate. Mr. Webster expressed himself briefly upon the subject. He said that his views were well known. He was for referring these petitions to an appropriate committee and entertaining discussion upon their report, such as it might be. Mr. Prentiss of Vermont next obtained the floor. He was not prepared to deny the right of Congress to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the District, and was decidedly in favor of the reception of petitions for that purpose. He vindicated the character of some of the abolitionists in his own State, and bore testimony to their increase in number and strength.

Mr. Preston of South Carolina closed the debates of the day with a speech in his imposing style. He called upon gentlemen of the South with great earnestness to awake to a true sense of the circumstances of their situation—to form a due estimate of the means, the operations and the numbers of the abolitionists. In a less enlightened age, one individual preached up a Crusade. What might not be done now, when thousands of individuals had engaged in a cause appealing not less forcibly to similar susceptibilities of our nature—when the fanaticism of liberty and religion were equally roused into action—when the most incessant and devoted exertions were made by those employed in the task, who had caught the contagion—when hundreds of affiliated societies were in active operation to forward the work of emancipation—when presses were subsidized, and the most tremendous engines were set in motion to influence popular opinion. It is idle, said Mr. P., to contend that these fanatics are not augmenting in numbers, or that they can be diverted from their incendiary labors. The question of abolition in this District and in the Southern States is pressing upon us with a great and portentous rapidity. It is a falling body, and gathers strength as it falls. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact. The proceedings of the emancipators of the North are pregnant with danger rapidly approaching. The public mind is bounding with the excitement, and the public mind is convulsed like the Pythoness upon the tripod. In England and in France, the developments of popular sentiment are all against us. The denunciations heard there reverberate throughout our own country. The pulpit lifts its voice against us, and the rostrum is erected to declaim against the enormity of our social institution. Do gentlemen say that this growing hostility can be speedily checked? Do they regard it as lightly as a summer cloud, as a slight popular breeze? Time may show how woefully mistaken they are.

Why, sir, it used to be a rare thing to have one of these abolition memorials thrust upon us. I remember that soon after I took my seat in the Senate, a petition of this kind was introduced. It was a novelty to me, and I was startled; but gentlemen told me to be under no concern, for it would be sent to the Lion's den, from which there was no egress. It would never be heard of more. But now, how have these petitions multiplied! They are poured in upon us in battalions. The Senator from Vermont has characterized these petitions, many of them, as good and honorable men. I do not doubt that there are many such engaged in these disorganizing measures. But is there any thing in this fact calculated to diminish our alarm? If virtuous and honest, though deluded, men, are lending their aid to this work, have we not reason for increased vigilance, jealousy and apprehension?

This party is growing at the North, and the inevitable consequence must be, that in elections that are to be held in future political canvasses, they will be courted and caressed by the two great contending parties.

Mr. Preston regarded the concerted movement upon the District of Columbia as an attempt to storm the gates of the citadel—as throwing the bridge over the moat. The South must resist the danger in its inception, or it would soon become irresistible. Look at the efforts these abolitionists are making. One person of wealth had pledged himself to subscribe one thousand dollars a month to aid in the cause. Twenty-five others had engaged to pay and had paid forty thousand dollars a year towards the undertaking. While such developments of the excited state of feeling among individuals and classes at the North were made, would Southern men stand up and say, we have no cause for alarm. The evil is yet distant. It is not increasing. Mr. Preston expressed in eloquent terms his attachment to the Union, and his belief in the inherent stability of our institutions. He appealed to high-minded Senators from the North—to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Webster) to devise some means, to suggest some plan by which the just alarm of the South might be allayed. He wished them to say how far they were disposed to go with them. He looked with confidence to their wisdom and patriotism in effecting the great object, which he believed they equally had in view.

After Mr. Preston concluded, Mr. Buchanan obtained the floor, and the Senate adjourned.

SENATE, Wednesday, March 9.

The petition of the Society of Friends at Philadelphia being taken up for consideration, the question pending being on the reception of the petition.

Mr. Calhoun addressed the Senate for about an hour and a quarter, in defence of his motion not to receive the petition. His argument was principally aimed at the opposition which had been made to his motion on the score of its being an abridgment of the right of petition. Against this conclusion he spoke with force and to considerable extent. He quoted the vote of the Senate, rejecting the York petition in 1834, on the same question, as it was decided that it should not be received.

Mr. Clay made a brief explanation of the character of the York petition, and the reasons which had led him to vote against its reception.

The question was then taken on the question to receive the petition, and decided as follows. YEAS.—Messrs. Benton, Brown, Buchanan, Clay, Clayton, Crittenden, Davis, Ewing, [H.] Ewing, [O.] Goldsborough, Grundy, Hendricks, Hill, Hubbard, Kent, King, [A.] King, [G.] Knight, Linn, McKean, Morris, Naudain, Niles, Prentiss, Robbins, Robinson, Ruggles, Shepley, Southard, Swift, Tallmadge, Tipton, Tomlinson, Wall, Webster, Wright—36.

NAYS.—Messrs. Black, Calhoun, Cuthbert, Leigh, Moore, Nichols, Porter, Preston, Walker, White—10.

Mr. Buchanan moved to reject the petition. Mr. Clay moved to amend the motion by adding as follows:

'For the Senate, without now affirming or denying the Constitutional power of Congress to grant the prayer of the petitioners, believe, even supposing the power uncontested, which it is not, that the exercise of it would be inexpedient.'

1st. Because the people of the District of Columbia have not themselves petitioned for the Abolition of Slavery within the District.

2d. Because the States of Virginia and Maryland would be injuriously affected by such a measure, whilst the Institutions of Slavery continue to subsist within their respective jurisdictions, and neither of these States would probably have ceded to the U. States, the territory now forming the District, if it had anticipated the

adoption of any such measure, without clearly and directly guarding against it; and

3. Because the injury which would be inflicted, by exciting alarm and apprehension in the States tolerating slavery, and by disturbing the harmony between them and the other members of the confederacy, would far exceed any practical benefit which could possibly flow from the abolition of slavery within the District.'

After some remarks from Mr. Clay and Mr. Preston, the latter of whom opposed the amendment, as only containing some, and these not the strongest reasons.

Mr. Porter moved to lay the motion on the table for further consideration, but, pending this question, On motion of Mr. Calhoun, The Senate adjourned.

ABOLITION IN THE DISTRICT.

The South forget that any people have rights but themselves. It seems never to have occurred to them, that in the District of Columbia, we of the North have the same right to demand the abolition of Slavery, that they of the South have to require its existence. Nor do they operate by force of reason and argument; they are accustomed to frighten and drive; and strange to tell, have actually frightened and driven the North whenever they have made the attempt.

Even the State of Georgia alone can seize upon the property of Indians, under the special protection of the United States; and the government even to countenance the act. The Tariff, by means of which New England is filled with manufactures, has been virtually repealed, and the protective principle wholly abandoned, through fear lest the South should secede from the Union. We are now threatened, that if we discuss the questions of abolishing Slavery in the United States, even peaceably and quietly among ourselves, that the Southern States will leave us and form a Government of their own. And we are now witnessing the powerful effects of this threat. New England hastens to satisfy the South that she gives no countenance to the principles and measures of the abolitionists. Public meetings are called in almost every village, and resolutions adopted discountenancing and condemning all the doings of abolitionists as the result of fanaticism. We must even get upon our knees and beg and entreat the South not to look upon this sin as chargeable to the whole people, but only as the work of a few deluded individuals, who, with us, are objects of hatred and contempt. These resolutions are printed and circulated throughout the Slaveholding States as evidence of public sentiment. Let the South should take offence and leave us, all these things are done by a people unanimously opposed to slavery, and earnestly desiring its abolition!

The Union is as dear to us as to any man in the community, yet we are unwilling to yield all our rights for the sake of its preservation. If in the eyes of our Southern brethren the right of holding slaves in the District of Columbia is of more importance than the Union of the States, let them go, and if they choose, form a government of their own. We can do better without them than they without us. And who would wish to be in alliance with a people, the existence of which alliance is to depend on their having their own way in every thing?

What reason have we to apprehend that the slaveholders dare put their threats into execution? They accumulate their wealth by the production and sale of certain staple articles, of which we are great consumers. But is the South the only place where these articles are produced? The West India Islands furnish plenty of sugar and molasses, and Texas and Darien are the best cotton growing countries in the world. Let us cease to purchase of our Southern brethren, and how long will it be before Texas alone would furnish an abundant supply? A duty of two or three cents a pound on Southern Cotton would show the South the importance of preserving the present confederacy.

Why, then, are we so alarmed at these threats of secession? Our duty is plain. We wish not to interfere with slavery in the slaveholding states without consent;—we simply wish the public mind to be enlightened upon the subject, and if slavery is wrong, as we believe it is, a virtuous people when properly enlightened will freely abolish it. But in the District of Columbia, we claim the right of interfering. So long as slavery there exists we are slaveholders. We claim the free exercise of this right regardless of threats. If we are wrong and are made sensible of it we are willing to abandon it; but we will never be driven silently to suffer the existence of evil, through fear of dissolving the Union.—Great Falls Journal.

[From the Salem Landmark.]

Mr. Editor—I love to recount the mercies of God, and trace in his providence the truth of his holy word, that 'like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him'; but we have not often an illustration of this text, so clear and delightful, as in the preservation of the property of Arthur Tappan & Co. and the circumstances attending it.

Little thought the merciless mob, or its more wicked instigators, that by forcing this godly man to secure his property from their savage violence by iron shutters, they were procuring for him a means of securing from fire that property which, with such little like pleasure, they would see destroyed. Little thought his persecuting neighbors that they were driving him for insurance away from the destruction which was to come upon themselves. And then what a grand opportunity these shutters procured that the colored people might not only save his property, but prove to the world how basely they had been slandered, when accused of wanting the better feelings of humanity, and of wanting energy to act when a motive was presented. It would seem as if the Lord in his providence would stop the mouth of every one, who pretends that there is any necessity for unhappiness that we are placed in the same country with others whose complexion is different, by showing how they treat those who treat them kindly.

Think you, Mr. Editor, that Mr. Tappan is unhappy because there are black men in New York? Will he be likely to enter into the 'Grand National Speculation,' by which it is pretended the nation will make a profit in transporting these people from the land of their birth to a heathen land? If we treat them well, where is the evil of their being here? Will, where is not the sin?

REFLECTIONS ON MARRIAGE.

Did young people seriously consider the important change which marriage must necessarily produce in their situation, how much more cautious would it make them in their choice of a companion for life! Alas! what avail the graces of the finest figure, the most captivating address, or the assemblage of all that is ensnaring, if the heart is depraved, or the conduct imprudent! The gayest associate of the convivial hour may be the dullest, the most unfit companion for the domestic circle; and he who is never satisfied but in a crowd, or when engaged in a continual round of pleasures, is very unlikely to make a tender and prudent husband. Should sickness or distress draw near, depend upon it he would fly from their approach.—If beauty alone excited his passion, it would cease to exist when you are deprived of those attractions on which it was founded. If fortune was his inducement, that will likewise soon lose its value in his sordid mind; and the very person who brought him the wealth for

which he sighed, will be considered as the grand obstacle to its enjoyment.—Too often is this unpleasant picture to be seen in many discontented families, which a little serious reflection might have prevented being so unfortunately realized. Never, however, may you shine in the gay circles of the world, if you are convinced that he has no relish for the enjoyments of retired life. The man who likes every house better than his own, will scarcely take the trouble of making home agreeable to others, while it is disgusting to himself. It will be the only place in which he will give way to his discontent and ill humor.—Such people are forever strangers to the dear delights of the social state, and all the real comforts of a well regulated family. He that is indiscriminately at home is never at home, and he feels himself a stranger or a visitor amid his closest connexions.

LIST OF ANTI-SLAVERY PUBLICATIONS, for sale at the office of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, No. 46, Washington-street, (third story.)

BOUND VOLUMES.
An inquiry into the character and tendency of the American Colonization and Anti-Slavery Societies, by the Hon. Wm. Jay, 2d edition.—Price, 38 cts.

A Reply to Jay's Inquiry, by D. M. Reese, M. D.—38.
The Testimony of God against Slavery, or a collection of passages from the Bible, which show the sin of holding property in man, with notes, by Rev. La Roy Sunderland, of Mass.—38.
The Oasis, by Mrs. D. L. Child of Boston. Author of an Appeal in favor of that class of Americans called Africans.—81.
Bourne's Picture of slavery in the U. States. 50cts.

Phelps' Lectures on slavery.—50.
A Memoir of Granville Sharpe, by Chas. Stewart, to which is added Sharpe's 'Law of passive obedience,' and an extract from his 'Law of Retribution.'—50.
The Abolitionist, bound.—75.
The Anti-Slavery Record, vol. I.—33.
Memoir of James Jackson, a colored boy, who died in Boston, Oct. 31, 1833, aged 6 years and 11 months.—25.
Dr. Channing on Slavery.—50.

The Anti-Slavery Fountain.—19 and 25.
Right and Wrong in Boston—a full exposition of the proceedings of the 21st Oct. 1835.—21.
PAMPHLETS.—Per Doz.
First, second, third and fourth Annual Reports of the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society.—81 and 2.
Birney's Letter on Colonization.—50cts.
Do. Do. to the Churches.—37.
Marriott's address to the 'Friends' on the duty of abstaining from the products of slave labor.—62 1-2.

Ivimey's Lecture on Colonial Slavery.—250.
Rev. Mr. Root's Fast Sermon.—50.
A sketch of W. L. Garrison's trial for an alleged libel on Francis Todd of Newburyport.—75.
'The Evils of Slavery and the cure of Slavery,' by Mrs. Child.—37 1-2.
Duty of Churches with reference to slavery and slaveholders.—18.

Oration, by David L. Child, in commemoration of British Emancipation.—125.
Productions of Mrs. Maria W. Stewart, a colored lady of Boston.—100.
Anti-Slavery Almanac for 1836.—50.
Peter Osborne's Oration before the colored people of New Haven, Ct.—75.
Eulogy on Wilberforce, by William Whipper.—100.
Trial of Prudence Crandall, a full report.—100.
May's Letter to the Editor of the Christian Examiner.—37 1-2.
Address of the N. Y. Young Men's A. S. Soc.—120.

The Maryland Scheme.—50.
Despotism of Freedom.—100.
The West India Question, by C. Stuart.—100.
Juvenile Poems, ornamented with nine wood engravings, for the use of free American children.—100.
The Slave's Friend, published monthly, being a series of Notes for children.—10.
British Opinions of the Am. Col. Soc.—75.
The Wesleyan Extra, a tract of 24 pages, containing Wesley's Thoughts upon slavery, published in the year 1774.—25.
Picture of a Slave in chains with the Negro's Complaint, in Poetry.—24.
Picture of a Slave in chains with Poetry by J. G. Whittier, Esq.—24.
Arrest and Trial of Rev. Geo. Storrs at Northfield, N. H.—25 cts.

The Slave Market of America.—75 cts.
Emancipation from the English.—81 each.
'Our liberties in danger'—a Thanksgiving Sermon by Rev. Calvin Cutler of N. H.—62 1-2.
The injustice and impolicy of the Slave Trade &c., by Jonathan Edwards, D. D.—75.
Subscriptions are also received for the Record, Emancipator, Human Rights, and Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine, at the same office.

March 9. HENRY E. BENSON, Agent.

PROPOSALS

For publishing the Poetical Works of Elizabeth Margaret Chandler: with a Memoir of her Life and Character, by Benjamin Lundy.

ALTHOUGH this amiable and highly gifted author was not extensively known, by name, yet some of her writings have been widely circulated, and greatly admired. She wrote, occasionally, for some of the popular periodicals of her day, in Philadelphia and elsewhere. During a period of more than eight years, she contributed largely and regularly to the pages of the 'Annals of Universal Emancipation.' She also acted as the principal editor of the Female Department of that work, (and was the author of nearly all the original matter in that department,) upwards of four years, previous to its temporary suspension in 1834. But, owing to her retiring modesty—her particular aversion to public notoriety, she very seldom permitted her name to the Press. The articles which she sent to the Press, thus, while a great number of readers even of the most refined taste in the circles of philanthropy and literature, were delighted and edified by the excellent productions of her pen, her exemplary character was little known beyond the pale of her family connexion and private acquaintance.

In order to furnish the reading community with a some of her most admired poetical works, in a separate and convenient form for preservation and use, a choice selection has been made. This will shortly be published, together with a memoir of her life, if a reasonable patronage should be obtained.

The whole will be comprised in a volume of about 200 pages, 18mo. It will be neatly printed, on fine paper, with a beautiful type, and handsomely bound in fancy muslin.

The price will be 62 1-2 cents per single copy—a liberal discount made to those who take ten or more copies, and become responsible for the payment.

Orders for the work must be forwarded (free of expense to the publisher) to LEMUEL HOWELL, No. 400 Coates Street, Philadelphia. It will be sent to press about the middle of the Fourth Month, (April) next, provided a sufficient number of copies shall be subscribed for, to defray the expense of publication.

Philadelphia, 2d Mo. 19th, 1836.